

## **REMARKS**

The following remarks are provided in support of the pending claims for the pending application.

### **I. Examiner Interview**

On July 26, 2007, Examiner Moll, SPE Kindred, and Applicant's Attorney met for an in-person interview at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Applicant's Attorney hereby submits a summary of the interview.

There was no exhibit or demonstration of the invention provided. The claims discussed during the interview included outstanding claims 1-25. The prior art reference, U.S. Patent No. 5,850,632 to *Robertson* was discussed as it was applied as the sole prior art rejection of the outstanding claims.

This interview took place following issuance of a Non-Final Office Action and submission of a response thereto. Prior to the interview, Applicant had amended the claims to further define the invention over the prior art of record. It was suggested by the Examiner and SPE Kindred that the spirit of the distinction between the prior art reference and the invention was not reflected in the amendment to the claims. More specifically, SPE Kindred requested further definition in the claims of shared memory and non-shared memory, and how the instructions distinguish therebetween.

### **II. Amendment to the Claims**

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, and 22 to further define his invention over the prior art. As discussed during the interview, Applicant's invention pertains to a multiprocessing computer system with multiple processors accessing shared memory, *i.e.* non-local memory, and individual processors having access to non-shared memory, *i.e.* local memory. More specifically, the invention pertains to ordering local memory operations in an arbitrary order, and ordering non-local memory operations. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification on page 1, lines 18-21, page 1, line 26 through page 2, line 4, page 7, lines 10-19 and page 7, line 21 through page 8, line 2. No new matter has been placed in the application with the amendments presented herein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the forgoing amendments to the claims, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims in their prior forms are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that she be contacted at the number indicated below.

For the reasons outlined above, an allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
By: /Rochelle Lieberman /  
Rochelle Lieberman  
Registration No. 39,276  
Attorney for Applicant

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC  
802 Still Creek Lane  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878  
Phone: (301) 948-7775  
Fax: (301) 948-7774  
Email: [rocky@legalplanner.com](mailto:rocky@legalplanner.com)

Date: August 14, 2007